arXiv:hep-th/0310009v1 1 Oct 2003

A Noncommutative Deformation of General Relativity

Ivan G. Avramidi

Department of Mathematics
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Leroy Place 801, Socorro, NM 87801, USA
E-mail: iavramid@nmt.edu

Abstract

We develop a novel approach to gravity in which gravity is described by a matrix-valued symmetric two-tensor field and construct an invariant functional that reduces to the standard Einstein-Hilbert action in the commutative limit. We also introduce a gauge symmetry associated with the new degrees of freedom.

Keywords: gravity, matrix general relativity, deformation, noncommutative geometry,
PACS: 02.40.Gh, 04.50.+h, 04.60.-m, 11.10.Nx, 11.90.+t, 12.90.+b

It is expected that the general relativistic description of gravity, and, as the result, of the space-time, is inadequate at short distances. There are many different proposals how to modify general relativity [1, 2, 3]. An appealing idea is that all these approaches will be somehow related within one big unifying picture.

In this Letter we propose to describe gravity by a matrix valued tensor field with a new gauge symmetry incorporated in the model. Our approach should be contrasted with the "noncommutative extensions of gravity" on non-commutative spaces [4, 5, 6, 7]; it is also different from the model studied in [8].

The basic notions of general relativity are based on the geometrical interpretation of the wave equation that describe propagation of fields *without internal structure*, (in particular, light). However, at the microscopic distances the role of light (photon) could be played by other gauge fields that, together with the photon, form a multiplet of gauge fields *with some internal structure.* That is why one has to consider a linear wave equation for such fields, i.e. instead of the scalar wave equation we have a *system* of linear second-order hyperbolic (wave) partial differential equations. This would cardinally change the standard geometric interpretation of general relativity. Exactly in the same way as a scalar equation defines Riemannian geometry, a system of wave equations will generate a more general picture, that we call *Matrix Riemannian Geometry.*

Let us consider a multiplet of fields $\varphi = \big(\varphi^A(x)\big)$. The capital Latin indices denote the internal indices and run from 1 to N. We consider a *hyperbolic* system of linear second-order partial differential equations of the form

$$L\varphi = [a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu + b^\mu(x)\partial_\mu + c(x)]\,\varphi = 0\,, \tag{1}$$

with *matrix-valued* coefficients $a^{\mu\nu} = \big(a^{\mu\nu A}{}_B(x)\big)$, $b^\mu = \big(b^{\mu A}{}_B(x)\big)$ and $c = \big(c^A{}_B(x)\big)$. The matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$ is supposed to be Hermitian and symmetric in the vector indices, i.e.

$$a^{\mu\nu} = a^{\nu\mu}\,, \qquad (a^{\mu\nu})^\dagger = a^{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{2}$$

Note that the matrix a transforms under diffeomorphisms as a contravariant matrix-valued two-tensor

$$a'^{\mu\nu}(x') = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\alpha}\frac{\partial x'^\nu}{\partial x^\beta}a^{\alpha\beta}(x)\,, \tag{3}$$

We can also consider the gauge transformations

$$\varphi(x) \longrightarrow U(x)\varphi(x)\,, \qquad a^{\mu\nu}(x) \longrightarrow U(x)a^{\mu\nu}(x)U(x)^{-1}\,, \tag{4}$$

where $U(x)$ is a nondegenerate matrix-valued function.

Let us consider the matrix

$$H(x,\xi) = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu\,, \tag{5}$$

where ξ is a cotangent vector. Obviously, it is Hermitian, $H^* = H$, and, therefore, has real eigenvalues $h_i(x,\xi)$ (we will assume that their multiplicities d_i are constant). Further, the eigenvalues are invariant under the gauge transformations (4) and transform under the diffeomorphisms as $h'_i(x', \xi) = h_i(x, \xi')$, where $\xi'_\mu = \dfrac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu}\xi_\alpha$.

The system of hyperbolic partial differential equation describes the propagation of a *collection of waves.* The operator L generates the causal structure on the manifold M as follows. First, we define the characteristics of the matrix hyperbolic operator L. Each eigenvalue defines a Hamiltonian system, i.e. a Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$h_i(x, \partial S) = 0\,, \tag{6}$$

and Hamilton equations

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_\mu} h_i(x, \xi)\,, \qquad \frac{d\xi_\mu}{dt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} h_i(x, \xi)\,. \tag{7}$$

These equations define different trajectories for each eigenvalue. The trajectories with tangents on the surface $h_i(x_0, \xi_0) = 0$ are the null trajectories and define different causal cones $\mathcal{C}_i(x_0)$. Each cone defines a causal set $\mathcal{I}_i(x_0)$ consisting of the absolute past $\mathcal{I}_i^-(x_0)$ and the absolute future $\mathcal{I}_i^+(x_0)$ as well as the exterior of the cone $\mathcal{E}_i(x_0)$. Since the points in all causal sets are causally connected with the point x_0, i.e. there is at least one time-like trajectory connecting those points with x_0, we define the *causal set* as the union of all causal sets $\mathcal{I}(x_0) = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{I}_i(x_0)$, similarly for the absolute past and the absolute future $\mathcal{I}^\pm(x_0) = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{I}_i^\pm(x_0)$, The *causally disconnected set* is defined as the intersection of the exteriors of all causal cones $\mathcal{E}(x_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^s \mathcal{E}_i(x_0)$. With these definition we have the standard causal decomposition $M = \mathcal{I}^-(x_0) \cup \mathcal{I}^+(x_0) \cup \partial\mathcal{I}(x_0) \cup \mathcal{E}(x_0)$. Since the causal cones vary from point to point, the structure of the causal set is different at different points. Such a picture can be interpreted as a "*fuzzy light-cone.*"

We see that in the matrix case the operator L does not define a unique Riemannian metric. Rather there is a matrix-valued symmetric 2-tensor field $a^{\mu\nu}$. Gravity will be described by new dynamical variable $a^{\mu\nu}$. Our goal is to construct a diffeomorphism-invariant functional $S(a)$ from the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$ and its first derivatives, which should be also invariant under gauge transformations (4) and reduce to the standard Einstein-Hilbert functional in the commutative limit.

First of all, we need a measure, i.e. a density $\mu(a)$ that does not depend on the derivatives of a and transforms under diffeomorphisms like $\mu'(x') = \mu(x)J(x)$, where $J(x) = \det\left[\dfrac{\partial x'^\mu(x)}{\partial x^\alpha}\right]$. We can write the measure in the form

$$\mu = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \rho\,, \tag{8}$$

where ρ is a matrix-valued density, i.e. $\rho'(x') = \rho(x)J(x)$. For example, ρ can be defined by

$$\rho(x) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\xi\, \Phi(x, \xi)\,, \tag{9}$$

where Φ is a positive function of single variable such that it decreases sufficiently fast as $\xi \to \infty$. The choice of the function Φ should guarantee the convergence of this integral. Note that this choice is obviously not unique. Another good candidate for the measure can be obtained as follows. Let

$$\psi = \frac{1}{n!}\varepsilon_{\mu_1\dots\mu_n}\varepsilon_{\nu_1\dots\nu_n}a^{\mu_1\nu_1}\cdots a^{\mu_n\nu_n}\,, \tag{10}$$

where ε is the standard completely antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol. The matrix ψ is obviously Hermitian, $\psi^\dagger = \psi$. We will require that this matrix is nondegenerate. Then the matrix $\psi^\dagger\psi$ is positive definite so that we can define ρ by

$$\rho = (\psi^\dagger\psi)^{-1/4}\,. \tag{11}$$

The matrix ρ is Hermitian, $\rho^\dagger = \rho$, and positive definite, $\rho > 0$, so that the measure is positive $\mu > 0$.

To construct an invariant functional we need objects constructed from the derivatives of the matrix a that transform like tensors. First of all, we define another matrix-valued tensor $b_{\mu\nu} = (b_{\mu\nu}{}^A{}_B)$ by

$$a^{\mu\nu}b_{\nu\lambda} = b_{\mu\nu}a^{\nu\lambda} = \delta^\mu_\lambda\mathbb{I}\,. \tag{12}$$

One can easily show that the matrix $b_{\mu\nu}$ satisfies the equation

$$b^\dagger_{\mu\nu} = b_{\nu\mu}\,, \tag{13}$$

but is not necessarily a Hermitian matrix symmetric in tensor indices, more precisely, $b^\dagger_{\mu\nu} \neq b_{\mu\nu}$, $b_{\mu\nu} \neq b_{\nu\mu}$.

Next we introduce matrix-valued coefficients $\mathcal{A}^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta} = \left(\mathcal{A}^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^A{}_B\right)$ that transform like the connection coefficients under the diffeomorphisms, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}'^{\mu'}{}_{\alpha'\beta'}(x') = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\nu}\frac{\partial x^\gamma}{\partial x'^\alpha}\frac{\partial x^\delta}{\partial x'^\beta}\mathcal{A}^\nu{}_{\gamma\delta}(x) + \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\nu}\frac{\partial^2 x^\nu}{\partial x'^\alpha\partial x'^\beta}\mathbb{I}\,. \tag{14}$$

We use these "matrix-valued connection" to define an operator $\mathcal{D}$ acting on tensors of type (p,q) by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\alpha\varphi^{A\mu_1\dots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\dots\nu_q} \;&=\; \partial_\alpha\varphi^{A\mu_1\dots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\dots\nu_q} + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathcal{A}^{\mu_j}{}_{\lambda\alpha}{}^A{}_B\varphi^{B\mu_1\dots\mu_{j-1}\lambda\mu_{j+1}\dots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\dots\nu_q}\\ &\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{q}\mathcal{A}^\lambda{}_{\nu_i\alpha}{}^A{}_B\varphi^{B\mu_1\dots\mu_p}_{\nu_1\dots\nu_{i-1}\lambda\nu_{i+1}\dots\nu_q}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Now it is not difficult to construct the "matrix-valued curvature" and the "matrix-valued torsion" by

$$(\mathcal{D}_\mu\mathcal{D}_\nu - \mathcal{D}_\nu\mathcal{D}_\mu)\varphi_\alpha = -\mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_{\alpha\mu\nu}\varphi_\lambda + \mathcal{T}^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{D}_\lambda\varphi_\alpha\,, \tag{16}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu} + \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\nu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\mu}\,, \tag{17}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\mu}\,. \tag{18}$$

To fix the connection we impose the *compatibility condition.* Unfortunately, such a condition is *not unique.* We take it in the form

$$\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} a^{\lambda\beta} + \mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu} a^{\alpha\lambda} = 0 \tag{19}$$

(which enables one to find an exact explicit solution of $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta\gamma}$ in terms of derivatives of the matrix $a^{\mu\nu}$) and require that the connection must be *symmetric in the commutative limit*, i.e. the torsion is purely a deformation artifact. The solution of these constraints is

$$\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} = \frac{1}{2} b_{\lambda\sigma}\left(a^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\rho\sigma} - a^{\rho\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\sigma\alpha} - a^{\sigma\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\alpha\rho}\right) b_{\rho\mu}\,, \tag{20}$$

By using the matrix curvature we can now construct a simple generalization of the standard Einstein-Hilbert functional (with cosmological constant). We define

$$S_0(a) = \int dx\, \frac{1}{16\pi G}\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_{\,V}\,\rho\left(a^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\alpha}{}_{\mu\alpha\nu} - 2\Lambda\right)\,. \tag{21}$$

This functional is obviously invariant under global gauge transformations.

One can easily make it local gauge symmetry by introducing a Yang-Mills field $\mathcal{B}$ and replacing the partial derivatives in the definition of the connection coefficients and the curvature by covariant derivatives. Of course, this must be also done in the compatibility condition (19) for that condition to be consistent with the gauge invariance.

Thus we obtain finally a gauged version of the above functional

$$S(a,\mathcal{B}) = \int\limits_{\Omega} dx\, \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_{\,V}\rho\left\{ \frac{1}{16\pi G}\left(a^{\nu\mu}\mathcal{R}^{\alpha}{}_{\mu\alpha\nu} - 2\Lambda\right) - \frac{1}{2e^2} a^{\nu\mu}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\alpha}a^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{F}_{\beta\nu}\right\}, \tag{22}$$

where e is the Yang-Mills coupling constant, ρ is defined by eq. (9) or (11)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu} + [\mathcal{B}_\mu, \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\nu}] - \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu} - [\mathcal{B}_\nu, \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\alpha\mu}] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\nu} - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}{}_{\beta\nu}\mathcal{A}^{\beta}{}_{\alpha\mu}\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^{\alpha}{}_{\lambda\mu} &= b_{\lambda\sigma}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}\Big[a^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\rho\sigma} + a^{\alpha\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\rho\sigma}] \\ &\quad - a^{\rho\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\sigma\alpha} - a^{\rho\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\sigma\alpha}] - a^{\sigma\gamma}\partial_\gamma a^{\alpha\rho} - a^{\sigma\gamma}[\mathcal{B}_\gamma, a^{\alpha\rho}]\Big]\Big\} b_{\rho\mu}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \mathcal{B}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathcal{B}_\mu + [\mathcal{B}_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\nu] \,. \tag{25}$$

Notice that (24) is nothing but the solution of the gauged version of the compatibility condition

$$\partial_\mu a^{\alpha\beta} + [\mathcal{B}_\mu, a^{\alpha\beta}] + \mathcal{A}^\alpha{}_{\lambda\mu} a^{\lambda\beta} + \mathcal{A}^\beta{}_{\lambda\mu} a^{\alpha\lambda} = 0 \,. \tag{26}$$

Here, according to our construction, the matrix affine connection $\mathcal{A}^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma}$ acts only from the left, however, the gauge connection $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ acts from *both* left and right as any gauge connection should.

Now we need to introduce the spontaneous breakdown of the gauge symmetry, so that in the broken phase in the vacuum there is just one tensor field, which is identified with the metric of the space-time. All other tensor fields must have zero vacuum expectation values. In the unbroken phase there will not be a metric at all in the usual sense since there is no preferred tensor field with non-zero vacuum expectation value. Alternatively, one could expect the gauge (*gravicolor*) degrees of freedom to be confined within the Planck scales, so that only the invariants (graviwhite states) are visible at large distances. For example, at large distances one could only see the diagonal part $g^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V a^{\mu\nu}$, which defines the metric of the space-time at large distances and the gauge invariants like $\frac{1}{N}\,\mathrm{tr}_V \mathcal{R}^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, etc., which determine in some sense the curvature of the spacetime.

This model may be viewed as a “noncommutative deformation” of Einstein gravity coupled to a Yang-Mills model. In the weak deformation limit our model describes Einstein gravity, Yang-Mills fields, and a multiplet of self-interacting two-tensor fields that interact also with gravity and the Yang-Mills fields. We speculate that the new degrees of freedom could only be visible at Planckian scales, so that they do not exhibit themselves in the low-energy physics. However, the behavior of our model at higher energies should be radically different from the Einstein gravity since there is no preferred metric in the unbroken phase, when the new gauge symmetry is intact.

Our model is, in fact, nothing but a generalized sigma model. So, the problems in quantization of this model are the same as in the quantization of the sigma model. We point out that the study of the one-loop approximation requires new calculational methods since the partial differential operators involved are not of the so-called Laplace type (non-scalar leading symbol). Most of the calculations in quantum field theory were restricted so far to the Laplace type operators for which nice theory of heat kernel asymptotics is available. However, the study of heat kernel asymptotics for non-Laplace type operators is quite new and the methodology is still underdeveloped. For example, even the first heat kernel coefficients (A_0, A_1 and A_2) needed for the renormalization in four dimensions are not known in general. For some progress in this area (the calculation of A_1) see [9, 10].

I am grateful to Giampiero Esposito for stimulating discussions. The financial support by the University of Naples and the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

[2] A. Konechny and A. Schwarz, *Introduction to M(atrix) theory and noncommutative geometry*, Phys. Repts. **360** (2002) 353–465

[3] C. Rovelli, *Loop Quantum Gravity*, Living Rev. Rel. **1** (1998) 1, gr-qc/9710008

[4] A. H. Chamseddine, G. Felder, J. Fröhlich, *Gravity in Non-Commutative Geometry*, Commun. Math. Phys. 155 (1993) 205–218

[5] A. H. Chamseddine, *Noncommutativity Gravity*, hep-th/0301112

[6] A. H. Chamseddine, *An Invariant Action for Noncommutative Gravity in Four-Dimensions*, J. Math. Phys. **44** (2003) 2534-2541

[7] J. Madore and J. Mourad, *A noncommutative extension of gravity*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **3** (1994) 221–224

[8] R. M. Wald, *A new type of gauge invariance for a collection of massless spin-2 fields: II. Geometrical interpretation*, Class. Quantum Grav. **4** (1987) 1279–1316

[9] I. G. Avramidi and T. Branson, *Heat kernel asymptotics of operators with non-Laplace principal part*, Rev. Math. Phys. **13** (2001) 847–890

[10] I. G. Avramidi and T. Branson, *A discrete leading symbol and spectral asymptotics for natural differential operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **190** (2002) 292–337